

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Kenneth Jordan Ezell, Jr.,)	C.A. #2:05-1084-PMD
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Social Security Administration, et al,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge George C. Kosko, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Kosko recommends that plaintiff’s application to proceed without prepayment of fees be denied, and that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff filed his objections on April 25, 2005.

In conducting this review, the court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendations as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court’s review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted). In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report. Accordingly, the magistrate judge's Report is incorporated into this order.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's application to proceed without prepayment of fees is **denied**, and the within case is **dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Patrick Michael Duffy

Patrick Michael Duffy
United States District Judge

Charleston, South Carolina

May 16, 2005

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within **thirty (30) days** from the date hereof pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.